

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Edmond Stanley Adams, III,	)	C/A NO. 6:12-3424-CMC-KFM
	)	
Petitioner,	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
v.	)	
	)	
Warden Eagleton,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

This matter is before the court on the *pro se* application for writ of habeas corpus, filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On April 9, 2013, Petitioner filed a motion for preliminary injunction. ECF No. 21.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). On May 3, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Petitioner’s motion for preliminary injunction be denied. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Petitioner filed objections to the Report on May 15, 2013.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. §

636(b).

After conducting a *de novo* review as to objections made, and considering the record, the applicable law, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, and Petitioner's objections, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order.

Petitioner's objections do not overcome the infirmities inherent in his motion for preliminary injunction; namely, that he cannot make a "clear showing" that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his petition. *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008).

Petitioner's motion for preliminary injunction is **denied**. This matter is returned to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial proceedings.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
May 17, 2013